

Atty Dkt. No.: 10010469-1  
USSN: 10/066,518

### **REMARKS**

In view of the following remarks, the Examiner is requested to allow claims 1-10, 13-19 and 44-46, the only claims pending and under examination in this application.

### ***Amendments***

Claims 1 and 44 have been amended to incorporate the limitation of Claim 14, and Claim 14 has been amended to change the phrase "majority" to 90%. Support for the 90% phrase is found on page 12, line 2 of the specification. As the above amendments introduce new matter, there entry by the Examiner is respectfully requested.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

Applicants note that an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS), including an SB/08A form, was submitted in this application on April 13, 2005. Applicants again respectfully request that the Examiner initial and return this SB/08A form, thereby indicating that the references cited in the IDS have been reviewed and made of record. For the Examiner's convenience, a copy of this form is enclosed herewith.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claims 1-10, 13, 18, 19, and 44-46 were again rejected under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(a) and 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Kowalis et al. (U.S. Patent 6,228,659).

Solely in order to expedite prosecution of the present application and without in any way agreeing with the position of the Patent Office, each of these claims now include the element of Claim 14 with respect to "the majority of the rows in arrays within a set being dispensed while the head is moving in a same direction along the rows. As Claim 14 was not included in this rejection, it is believed that this rejection may be withdrawn.

Atty Dkt. No.: 10010469-1  
USSN: 10/066,518

***Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claim 16 was again rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kowalis et al., *supra*, in view of Gordon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,486,452). In view of the above amendment to Claim 1 upon which Claim 16 depends, it is believed that this rejection may be withdrawn.

Claim 17 was again rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kowalis et al., *supra*, in view of Zeleny et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,215,894). In view of the above amendment to Claim 1 upon which Claim 17 depends, it is believed that this rejection may be withdrawn.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicants again acknowledge with appreciation the indicated allowability of Claims 14 and 15.

Atty Dkt. No.: 10010469-1  
USSN: 10/066,518

### CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that all of the claims are in condition for allowance, which action is requested. If the Examiner finds that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, please telephone Timothy Joyce at (408) 553-2510

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any underpayment of fees associated with this communication, including any necessary fees for extensions of time, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1078, order number 10010469-1.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 5, 2006

By:   
Richard A. Schwartz  
Registration No. 48,105

Date: September 5, 2006

By:   
Bret E. Field  
Registration No. 37,620

AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.  
Legal Department, DL429  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 7599  
Loveland, CO 80537-0599

F:\DOCUMENT\AGIL\199 (10010469-1)\10010469-1 (AGIL-199) RFOA of 7 7 06.doc